

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viriginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,792	03/07/2002	Marcel J.G. Janssen	2001B031A	2963
	7590 09/29/2004		EXAMINER	
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY P O BOX 2149			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
	TX 77522-2149		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10,092792 EXAMINER ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ Th	s application has been examined	Responsive to communicatio	n filed on 8-10-64	This action is made final.
	ened statutory period for response to to respond within the period for respo			om the date of this letter.
Part I	THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(	S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:		
1. 3. 5.	Notice of References Cited by Ex Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, I Information on How to Effect Drai	PTO-1449.	4. Notice of Informal Patent	tent Drawing Review, PTO-948. Application, PTO-152.
Part II	SUMMARY OF ACTION			
1.	Claims	9 and 11-	-18	_ are pending in the application.
	Of the above, claims		are	withdrawn from consideration.
2.	Claims			_ have been cancelled.
3. [	Claims			_ are allowed.
4.	Claims	9 and 1	1-18	_ are rejected.
5.	Claims			_ are objected to.
6.	Claims		are subject to restriction	on or election requirement.
7.	This application has been filed with	nformal drawings under 37 C.F.R.	1.85 which are acceptable for exam	ination purposes.
8. 🗌	Formal drawings are required in res	oonse to this Office action.		
9. 🗆	The corrected or substitute drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable			
10.	The proposed additional or substitute examiner;		. has (have) been	☐ approved by the
11.	The proposed drawing correction, file	ed, has be	een □approved; □disapproved	(see explanation).
12.	Acknowledgement is made of the cla			eceived  not been received
13. 🗌	Since this application apppears to be accordance with the practice under B			the merits is closed in
44 🗀	Othor			

Application/Control Number: 10/092,792

Art Unit: 1754

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of copending Application No. 09/924016. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would be prima facie obvious to provide a silicoaluminophosphate molecular sieve having no reflection peak in the 9.8 to 12.0 (2 ) range in the claims of S.N. 09/924016.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/092,792

Art Unit: 1754

Page 3

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Wayne Langel at telephone number 571-272-1353.

Wáyne Langel Primary Examiner Art Unit 1754